1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

423 own the land: we all owned it, so that a man could choose what land he pleased." Women also owned fields, that is, normally only widows who had no male members of their families to plant for them.

[133] Since floods were slow and mild on the Gila, a stream with low gradient and wide flood plains, there were no difficulties caused by a marauding stream necessitating relocation of the fields.

Boundaries came into dispute: such quarreling had its special name, xamĭltŏ'tà ak,e'vàm, "[boundaries] bristling side by side." This was one of the rare occasions when the dead were named, not in insult, but as warrant of ownership. "My father had his land over to there, but when you took it you pushed it [the boundary] over to here"; to which the other would reply, "No, my land extended farther to your side." Exasperating and [578] drawn-out quarrels arose over minute pieces of land. If they [627] finally reached the fighting stage, a third man was called on to decide. He might say, "Your land is good enough to that place, so give up this little piece for his benefit, so he will not have any more to say," or he would divide the disputed patch equally. [171] There were, however, no pushing contests or stick fights over disputed boundaries in the manner of the Mohave.[10]

Cultivation in all its stages was man's work, but gathering the 462 harvest was woman's alone. At that time men were busy making [343] the store houses for pumpkins and watermelons. An old woman, with no men to help her, would, of course, plant for herself.

423 It is now difficult, with the old fields long done away with, to discover what the ownership of field tracts may have been. But 428 it seems to have followed on this male occupation with cultivation that fields were, on the whole, regarded as the personal possessions of men. Inheritance was specifically said to be in the male line. Normally when a man died, the land was inherited by his immediate family: his widow, sons and daughters. Ultimately it came into the possession of the children. A daughter would get some one to plant for her. It may well be that daughters did 423 not transmit their claim.

768 During the period of mourning, the survivors made no use of

[10] Kroeber, *Handbook*, p. 744.

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

584 their son to marry. Then the first family would say nothing whatever of their gifts: this was quite within her rights.

591 The young couple took up their residence in the home of the groom's parents. In fact some households became quite large when several sons brought home their wives. It was sometimes convenient for them to build a house of their own at once: they always did so following the birth of their second child. Their house might be located anywhere in the village, not of necessity beside the husband's former home. Since the farm lands, which [428] were inherited, were located at a distance from the village and house sites were not heritable property, there was no compulsion in the forms of inheritance to do so.[58]

It was thought unnatural for a man to live with his wife's family, unless his help was really needed there. They believed he must be jealous that he kept his wife from his family or his erstwhile companions who still frequented his former home.

428 591 It was a saying that a younger son or daughter would stay at home with their parents. Such a daughter would be joined by her husband. The older sons brought their wives home, but went off later to establish homes of their own. The older daughters marry elsewhere. Then the youngest at home inherited (Kutox). [This was obviously a matter of chance rather than any formalized junior inheritance.]

553 A new social configuration settled about the couple. From [585] this time forward, the bride was regularly called by the name of her sib by the husband's family, especially its women members. Similarly, the groom was derisively nicknamed by his wife's relatives. They called him ugly like an animal or referred to some discreditable habit. The invention of the nickname was uniform- [606] ly credited to his mother-in-law, although she may not have been its originator at all. A man was expected to treat his mother-in-law just like his wife. There was no mother-in-law taboo, nor one between father- and daughter-in-law. Brothers-in-law considered themselves close relatives and made it a point to help each other. [607] Between brothers- and sisters-in-law a certain amount of licence was permissible: they might say anything to each other, even to obscenity, without offense.

[58] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 228.

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

787 The incipient stages of dreaming in childhood, the setting from which the significant dream might mature are revealed by two anecdotes.

When W——was but a few years old, he was followed everywhere by his pack of pups. He said he could understand what dogs said. When one was barking in the distance, he said, "He is telling us to come: he knows where there is meat hidden." Or "He is telling us that he is being beaten. He says, 'My master is not kind to me.'" The old people said he must have been dreaming of dogs.

The important point here is that the elders were implying that this precocity could be turned to account in later life by assuming that the boy's course of dreaming had already begun. The other anecdote shows a course of dreaming well begun in a lad of about sixteen. The setting of the dream is modern, but its repetitive form is of the old type.

A boy kept repeating certain words to himself, "Children of Castovia."[1] He said he could not get them out of his mind. He always dreamed he was going along a wide straight road, with nothing but right hand turns; at each turn was a sign "Children of Castovia." He said he reached the place (directed by these sign posts): it was a big house, full of children, with this sign on the door.

428 787 Inheritance of power, so far as it occurred at all, also revolved about such incipient stages of dreaming in childhood, but the powers were not used until the heir was adult and until the death of the parent.

A father who had dreamed songs would tell his child as soon as he was old enough to understand, how he came to see these things and how to go about seeing them. Then when the child grew to be a man, he always took after his father, that is, always after the father died.

A case in point, cited below, is the attempt of a son to take over the Mountain Killdeer songs of his father by dreaming of this spirit after his father's death. A specific case of inheritance was that of xatisa'là, the Halchidhoma chief, who dreamed the songs Deserted (vŭspo') and Enemy Standing (hwĭcĭvau'). His son, who was not chief, was known as the dreamer of the Deer song. All that seems to be inherited in this case was the tendency to dream. I do not know of any connection between these songs.

[1] This was said to be meaningless by the narrator of the anecdote, but it is palpable he was repeating the slogan of a common patent-medicine advertisement tacked up at every fence-corner.

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

Inasmuch as it was said that "there was one war leader [at a time]; when he died another took his place at dreaming," the suggestion is that, in general, the normal course was for a successor to dream the specific powers. This was specifically the case with chieftainship: the dead chief's successor (normally his son) dreamed the necessary oratorical powers. From this point of view, filial inheritance is to be regarded as only a special case. Certainly filial inheritance was not stressed. My informants repeatedly referred to shamans and singer without remarking that their fathers had had these capacities before them.

Both the progressive change in the character of the songs as they were learned in dreams and their withdrawal by the spirits because they were sung before the revelation was completed are exemplified by the following account.

A man sang the Mountain Killdeer songs [when young]. He would sit in broad daylight working on the cotton he was going to weave and still hear the bird's songs. He could hear them just as though a person was sitting beside him singing. He sang that he was taken by this little bird during the night to the bird's home at vikwâme' [the Mohave sacred mountain], where he was taught the songs by the bird. Mountain Killdeer had sung these songs to him for more than a year. He called it vitaxi'c n,ĭmsa'vâ, "white mountain killdeer." Then he went to Mountain Killdeer again, who now sang to him that his songs had turned black, meaning that he did not like this man because he had sung too early. The man told this, singing:

avinyaya'ka	mavinyaya'ka
he is going	
vĭtaxi'cvas	kwinyamusa'vic
mountain killdeer	twilight
amicova'xâ	matiṇinyamviyak
song	dark going

He sang this song at gatherings.[2] He no longer mentioned "white" in his songs. He would tell how the bird had said that he, the young man, had had his songs taken back. The old people said he would die young: he did.

The son of this man said it was queer that he did not dream of this, get it, after his father died, because this usually happened to a child. Then he did dream of it twice. He dreamed he was taken to a butte near Tempe and then to another. When he woke late he told his grown daughters. He then dreamed again that the person [spirit] appeared to him and was angry because he had told too soon. The person said, "I will never take you again." To make him forget what he had

[2] The method of singing and the associated dance are described elsewhere (pp. 231–33, 266).